

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
JULY 17, 1997**

PROJECTS REVIEWED

Convened: 8:00 AM

Ballpark Pedestrian Plan
Queen Anne Boulevard Restoration Plan and Design Guidelines
Terminal 18
Aquarium "Sound to Mountain" Exhibit
Space Needle and Broad Street Improvements
Pacific Place
Holly Park Community Facilities

Adjourned: 4:40 PM

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Gerald Hansmire
Moe Batra
Carolyn Darwish
Gail Dubrow
Robert Foley
Rick Sundberg

STAFF PRESENT

Marcia Wagoner
Peter Aylsworth
Vanessa Murdock

071797.1 Project: **BALLPARK PEDESTRIAN PLAN**
 Phase: Revised plan
 Presenters: Steve Pearce, Office of Management and Planning
 Mark Clemmens, Seattle Transportation
 Janet Pels, Public Facilities District
 Larry Goetz, NBBJ
 Time: 1hr. 15min. (0.3%)

Since last appearing before the Commission the Preliminary Draft of the Ballpark Pedestrian Plan has been presented to Lot B Associates, Pioneer Square Preservation District Board, and the City Council Transportation Committee. Letters have been received from the public and from city employees resulting in the revised Ballpark Pedestrian Plan of June 1997. There have been relatively few changes to the previous Ballpark Pedestrian Plan. The primary changes have occurred in the following segments:

- segment 1 Widening the sidewalk has been given a higher priority;
- segment 5a The plan proposes to improve pedestrian lighting, add street trees, remove one lane of traffic, and widen the sidewalks.
- segment 13 Due to concerns, the plan proposes to shift some traffic from Jackson between 5th and I-5 to Dearborn.

Improvements to 1st Ave. S. were reduced to street trees on the ballpark side only. The patch and repair of sidewalks rather than their replacement is suggested, which will also reduce costs. The criteria for allocating funds have been reprioritized to focus on safety, neighborhood, access and use, each of which will be considered regarding cost/benefit, permanency of improvement, and balance of concern, (see p.25). The Pioneer Square Preservation District Board disapproved of the intended banners, based on the conceptual idea of lights in mesh, (see p. 33). A network map of pedestrian connections shows major streets with existing improvements, improvements not currently funded, improvements to be funded by others, (see p. 23).

All page numbers reference the Pedestrian Connections Plan by Weinstein Copeland Architects (June 1997).

For more information, see the Design Commission minutes 5/15/97, 3/20/1997.

Discussion

Foley: I'm pleased that there has been an emphasis on the daily pedestrian improvements. The previous plan, I felt, focused more on moving masses of people during game events. Do you feel that there is something not in this plan that could be a valuable pedestrian improvement?

Pearce: We feel pretty comfortable that this is the right array of improvements, given the reality of what funds are available. A major factor in the decision to lessen the intensity of improvement south of the ballpark is due to the fact that there never will be any funds. There is only so far we can go before we are solving someone else's problems. Probably one street that we didn't address that might need to be

addressed in the future is Dearborn, between 5th and I-5. The problem is that it needs to be addressed holistically with the surrounding areas, the international district and the neighborhood planning effort.

Goetz: The new football stadium adds the ability of doing some additional improvements in this plan that might not have come about otherwise. The International District wants people to walk through their neighborhood on their way to the ballpark rather than just driving through or parking.

Pearce: Of course, the stadium will have to make improvements on the streets adjacent to the site such as Occidental St.

Batra: How did you arrive at the \$1.2 million figure?

Pearce: A pedestrian workshop, held last fall, came up with the idea of developing a pedestrian network. We then generated some cost estimates for improvements to that pedestrian network. Generally they were less ambitious than the sort of things we are doing here.

Clemmens: In negotiations for street vacations with the PFD we arrived at \$1.2 million as a reasonable cost estimate to build a basic skeleton of improvements.

Pels: The PFD has tried to knit a comprehensive environment that is going to be pedestrian friendly 365 days a year. It's a look at what the entire pedestrian fabric should be. We think we have made an important contribution to the city with this plan and think that \$1.2 million is a significant investment and we also acknowledge that there are many other significant investments that are going to be made over a brief period of time.

Hansmire: I have a very nervous overview with what I am seeing here, not necessarily with this plan, but with who is overseeing all the various projects in the area. There are a lot of projects going on down there and I am concerned with how this fits into the package. Whether it's \$10 million and 1.2 million added to it for \$800 million worth of construction projects, it seems pretty insignificant. I am finding it very difficult to see the coordination and that really bothers me. I would encourage some place in the city or the county to give these projects some coordination.

Pearce: You aren't the only person to have that perception. We are doing it; it's just not a very public activity.

Hansmire: How can the street improvements be designed and the mitigation cost decided before the football stadium has done an EIS?

Foley: Your overall improvement package, I think, gives some direction. I can see the potential for multiple connections with surrounding neighborhoods in the football stadium project. Who decides the priorities for integrating it into the pedestrian network so that it seems an extension of this plan?

Clemmens: The same people that have been involved with this plan will be involved with the football stadium. We have talked about how we within the Departments coordinate these efforts.

Pearce: The King St. Station area is very complex. The moment we sit down and draw the plans something changes. It is very much a real-time situation.

Hansmire: When you bring this into a cohesive package there is nobody with the overview responsibility. There's no captain on the ship.

Darwish: Why was Washington St. east of 5th not included in the improvement plans?

Goetz: We kept pushing the boundary further and further and still didn't get to Washington St. Also, the volumes of traffic didn't warrant consideration.

Pearce: That street wasn't raised as a priority by the International District.

Foley: The heart of these improvements is where distinctly different neighborhoods converge. I think it's important that the strategy of the plan responds to the unique character of each neighborhood.

ACTION: **The Commission recommends approval of the priority list of improvements as presented. Furthermore, the Commission strongly encourages the city to appoint a coordinator for the development and implementation of current and future projects in the south downtown area.**

071797.2 Project: **BIGELOW AVENUE, QUEEN ANNE BOULEVARD RESTORATION
PLAN AND DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Phase: Briefing

Presenters: Rosemary Wills, Department of Parks and Recreation
Terrance Dunning, Department of Parks and Recreation

Attending: Bob Watson, Bigelow Ave. resident
Linda Dagg, Bigelow Ave. resident
Caryn Buck, Bigelow Ave. resident

Time: 1hr. 15min. (0.3%)

Queen Anne Boulevard is a network of fifteen different named streets winding around the top of Queen Anne hill. It is a popular route for walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and sightseers. It was recognized in 1979 for its historic characteristics by the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board. Queen Anne Boulevard is 3.69 miles in length and varies in width. The Bigelow Ave. segment of the boulevard is approximately 14 blocks long, beginning at Prospect St. and curving north to Galer St., then north to Wheeler St. Bigelow Ave. is 66 ft. wide in most places, but as much as 80 ft. at some points. There are 114 private properties on Bigelow Ave. Many blocks of Bigelow Ave. have mature and aging trees, an important and distinctive aspect of the area. Due to the hillside nature of the site there are many landscaped rockeries and various types of walls, most of which are located on private property.

Since few master plans are in place for the city's boulevards, the restoration program desires to develop some design guidelines (see Design Guidelines draft-7/14/97). The general design intent for park boulevards and trails is that the design guidelines and landscape plans to be developed should:

1. visually establish a sense or character of public park property;
2. respect the original design intent and historic use of the boulevard system;
3. provide a design continuity discernible to persons using the boulevard or trail for park, recreation, or transportation purposes;
4. encourage public use of park boulevards and trails that is appropriate to the size, scale, and capacity of the facility;

5. provide improvements on park boulevard and trails that are compatible with the neighborhood and appropriate for the user community;
6. provide a safe and accessible route for pedestrians. Other non-pedestrian uses, such as bicycles or skates, may be accommodated, if appropriate. Automobile traffic should be restricted to portions of boulevards that function as street roadways;
7. allow access across park boulevard or trails for driveway, pedestrian walkway, utilities, or other necessary purposes if such access is a legal right of the adjacent property owner and if other access is not available;
8. allow and encourage property owners adjacent to park boulevards to participate in landscape improvement and maintenance, consistent with Department design guidelines and landscape plans;
9. seek to minimize disruption for park boulevard or trail users and neighbors when making changes or improvements determined through a public review process;
10. include visible markers to identify park boulevards or trails.

(for more information, reference the draft Design Intent of 7/15/97)

In a draft proposal, the Department of Parks and Recreation desires to eliminate non-park uses on Bigelow Ave. through a comprehensive program spanning 1 to 3 years. The intent is to remove barriers, primarily hedges and other plants, which hinder access to public property. In this draft proposal, they are not requiring sidewalks where sidewalks were not originally located. These additional sidewalks are a controversial aspect of the proposal. Some residents feel sidewalks are unnecessary and that Bigelow Ave. is beautiful the way it is. Another controversial component is the Parks Department's desire to limit all properties to a single driveway, no wider than 10 ft. Those properties with multiple driveways or driveways exceeding 10 ft. will be assessed an annual fee or be required to remove the excess paving. The retroactive nature of this proposal is disturbing to some residents.

Discussion

Foley: Will your plan identify a time frame?

Wills: Yes.

Wagoner: Was there a singular planting along the boulevard originally?

Wills: No, I don't think so. There were multiple plantings of various types.

Dunning: There has been an adopted tree plan for a number of years now, revised in 1986.

Dagg: Between 1910 and 1916 a variety of trees were planted over 3.5 miles.

Foley: Does the street width allow for two lanes of traffic and parking?

Dunning: It's possible. The Parks Department will maintain its property, however, not to the level of private maintenance. Therefore, we welcome residents to continue their efforts to keep up the area.

Wills: There are no restrictions on parking at this time. Residents have stated that they don't want any excessive signage. "No parking" signs would comprise a large amount if parking is not allowed on the street.

Sundberg: Why disallow an irrigation system if it makes it more difficult for the residents to continue their maintenance? It's not Seattle's water nor is it their expense. You are cutting the parks department off from receiving free resident maintenance.

- Dunning:** It is a response to the need for heavy trucks and equipment required to maintain trees. The heavy equipment breaks sprinkler heads and can damage underground systems. We are not trying to discourage people from continuing their maintenance of park property around their homes, in fact we welcome it.
- Dubrow:** Can you accomplish the same maintenance without driving up on the green space?
- Dunning:** Not very well. Primarily because the trees in this area are so old and so large. It becomes inefficient and too costly.
- Batra:** How will you set the fees for the driveways that are on Parks Department property? Will they be retroactive?
- Dunning:** They are definitely not going to be retroactive. We are allowing a 10 foot maximum driveway. Anything over that will be charged a fee. There is an ordinance in place already to assess the fees. It is based on the assessed value of the adjacent private property multiplied by the square feet involved multiplied by a set rate being calculated at the moment.
- Foley:** Are the park right-of-way policies the same as those of city streets? Are the home owners liable for injury or for damage occurring on the right-of-way? Who is accountable for damage and injuries?
- Dunning:** First let me say that neither of us are lawyers here. We have paid claims in the past for limb damage etc. The Parks Department owns the property here. It is distinctively different from a street right-of-way, which is a surface easement. We actually own the land.
- Wagoner:** In the cases of structures built on park property, did they have permits?
- Dunning:** It's sort of a mixed bag situation. Some of the buildings had permits, some were built without permits, and some were built prior to permits being required. In a very few cases they do have permits to use park property.
- Watson:** We have been asked by our neighbors to come forward and present this letter with attached guidelines which we feel would be fair. The biggest problem according to residents is 'if it's not broke, don't fix it'. The retroactive aspect of all this is just incredible. We, the residents, have developed guidelines that address prospective activity rather than retroactive activity. This whole thing doesn't increase park use of this land. I can't see any additional public use of this boulevard as a result of what they are asking us to do. We are being punished, if you will, for being stewards of this land, sometimes for 40 or 50 years. In 1986 we had retroactive taxes. How fair is it for all of us to have taken care of this land for all these years and then to have the city parks department come in and say; since we didn't do our job for the last 50 years, we are not going to make you pay for it. This is just like a condemnation proceeding. We're aware of the public land. We feel we've done a good job taking care of it. We've gotten permits to do what we've been doing on it. We love the neighborhood the way it is, that's why we choose to live there. When you take all of the parking that is off street now and put it on street, you are taking a great looking boulevard and turning it into Capitol Hill.
- Foley:** If one were to ignore, for the moment, the issue of the retroactive charges; how far apart are your proposals from the city's proposals?
- Watson:** They are very close.

Batra: I sense frustration, even anger in your voice. However, if I'm going to err in judgment, I want to err on the side of the public interest.

Buck: What seems ludicrous to us is that they don't want to pay for the upkeep of their property claiming it has no value to the public. To take out my driveway would move two cars off my property and force them to be parked on the street. What does that improve? Who does that help? According to city code any property with a street side longer than 80ft. is allowed two curb-side accesses to the property. Now the Parks Department won't allow that.

Hansmire: Part of the issue is how nominal is the payment to have this driveway?

Buck: A minimum of \$100 per year. It costs me over \$1000 to maintain my yard. I could reduce the cost and the standard, but it would still be more than \$100 a year of my own money that I would pay.

Hansmire: Aren't we talking about legal issues of policy rather than issues of design?

Dunning: The overwhelming majority of residents maintain park property and do not have non-park uses to deal with. So they're doing it without any compensation other than the enhancement of their property.

Watson: People drive from all over the city to park their cars and take a walk on the boulevard. There is no limitation to access. This proposal is just a way to retroactively step everyone back off park property and still ask them to maintain it. Public access won't be improved one iota.

Buck: Ask yourselves from a design standpoint, would it look better to have cars parked along the street rather than on private property.

Dagg: Bigelow is approximately 1 mile out of 22 miles of the boulevard system that these policies will be applicable to. Many other sections have far worse conflicts to be resolved with the Parks Department, so this will continue to be a very controversial issue.

ACTION: **Briefing only. Action was delayed to a later date due to the amount of information and comments received.**

071797.3 Project: **TERMINAL 18**
 Phase: Schematics
 Presenters: George Blomberg, Port of Seattle
 Michael Burke, Port of Seattle
 Attendees: Beverly Barnett, Seattle Transportation
 Joe Taskey, Seattle Transportation
 Marilyn Senour, Seattle Transportation
 Time: 1hr. (.3%)

The Harbor Island expansion of Terminal 18 will be similar to the new Terminal 5. The Port of Seattle in conjunction with SSA hopes to issue bonds in April 1998 and begin construction in May 1998. Traffic and parking, along with the preservation of businesses, are the Port's major concerns. They propose to vacate 29 acres of public right-of-way that is currently 200 ft. wide and occupied by rail cars. The proposal provides a realignment of the entrances to Harbor Island at the Spokane St. corridor. The main improvements include vehicular access using a ramp segment over the new railroad tracks, and an ADA accessible pedestrian bridge over the tracks connecting the parking areas with Todd Shipyards Corporation. The vehicular access ramp will be of stabilized earth with clear spans over the tracks. The pedestrian bridge is required to be ADA accessible and therefore necessitates an elaborate system of ramps to reach the needed height. The intent is to have minimal visual and vehicular impedance to the largely industrial area. The Port is creating a public shoreline park space, about 1.3 acres and approximately 400 ft. long, on the west waterway. There are also landscape and access improvements proposed for the Spokane St. area.

Discussion

Dubrow: Private parking is a questionable use of public land.

Foley: Is there a way, by designating certain parking for the disabled, that the actual pedestrian bridge would not have to be accessible? I suppose it would have to be, regardless.

Taskey: We have discussed that question extensively. We feel that we can't create a situation where a disabled person could get to a place such as the parking area and then not be able to get to out of there. We have been very addimate about leaving that an ADA structure. The parking lots will also serve as capping devices for contaminated soils.

Blomberg: The Port of Seattle has been working in collaboration with the various city departments and agencies. This design represents our cooperative efforts.

Darwish: Since so much public land or right-of-way is being given up, what amenities are you giving to the public?

Blomberg: We have emphasized the economic benefits of retaining jobs in the area. This is an industrial site as aposed to other locations in the harbor. There is a 1.3 acre public shoreline being developed on the west waterway.

- Burke:** None of the vacated streets abut the water. We are replacing old streets that are in disrepair. We are adding sidewalks, rebuilding railroad tracks, and using the parking surfaces to cap contaminated areas. We are also spending time, money, and effort relocating businesses so they remain in the region.
- Foley:** Will all the vacated streets become Port property?
- Burke:** Yes.
- Dubrow:** Could you tell us the nature of your existing agreement with the city?
- Barnett:** What they are talking about is a compensation agreement which addresses the circumstance under which the city will charge them a street vacation fee. The street vacation fee is payment for the acquisition of the right-of-way. That is separate, and does not address anything that is before the Commission or the City Council. Nothing in our agreement limits the city's discretion in reviewing or denying any street vacation position. Compensation is never used for mitigation.
- Batra:** From a safety point of view, is the proposed overpass the only access to the island? If an accident occurred in that area, would people be trapped on the island?
- Burke:** The bridge is only one way to get on. In addition, there is a parallel road system. In case of an emergency the terminal is open and accessible for emergency vehicles to get through.
- Blomberg:** That's a good point. We have been working with fire and police to reconfigure the streets south of the island with the proposed overpass which will improve accessibility.
- Dubrow:** My concern is that the proposed parking resolves problems of containment but creates enormous problems in terms of the connection between parking and where people work.
- Burke:** That is where they are parking today. By paving it we are actually increasing the efficiency as well as capping the area. The rail barge operation, owned by Union Pacific Railroad, is not in the realm of our project and so cannot be viewed as an alternative parking solution. We have looked at other properties in this area. We have looked at a parking structure as an alternative. The Port feels that is not cost effective due to Todd's uncertain long-term viability.
- Dubrow:** It seems like a very awkward resolution.
- Hansmire:** Being an industrial area, you need to seek a design reflective of that. I think street trees and landscaping don't maintain the integrity of an industrial site. It should be clean, but not strive to be decorative.
- Dubrow:** It's not a design issue, it's a planning and siting issue. I would like to see other alternatives that don't require a pedestrian bridge to solve a problem that location would resolve. I think the bridge on the lower end makes sense.
- Wagoner:** Is there an alternative that might not have been explored?
- Burke:** I don't know of one. We could present more information on the analysis.
- Blomberg:** When looking for a space for 1,100-1,200 vehicles, the only place was south of our proposed rail line.
- Sundberg:** When you are looking at a sole user of the parking areas and the need for an elaborate pedestrian system, perhaps the idea of off-site parking with a shuttle system deserves investigation.

- Taskey:** The ADA requirements drive the elaborate nature of the pedestrian overpass. We are legally bound to make it an ADA accessible structure.
- Dubrow:** There are two issues to be dealt with; alternative locations for rail and parking, and public amenities provided in exchange for vacation of many acres of right-of-ways. I understand sidewalks and trees are involved, but I'm not persuaded that they are really useful in this situation. What are the real benefits? Are they on this site or in some other location?
- Burke:** In looking at the rail location we explored 50 or 60 schemes. The trains we have to accommodate are 8,000 feet long and limit the configurations that fit on such an odd shaped island. The proposed train access to the island will eliminate most of the traffic congestion on the through streets south of the island by allowing a full length train to pull into the site, park, and break apart.
- Blomberg:** The geometry of the site and the industrial needs of the Port and other users lead to this configuration.
- Sundberg:** I share Gail's comments on the pedestrian bridge. It's an extraordinary exercise to pay for just for putting things on the wrong side of the road. I agree with the vehicular solutions at the south end. I'm not opposed to having a pedestrian bridge.
- Batra:** Have you explored the possibility of building a pedestrian tunnel under the railroad tracks?
- Burke:** The ground water in that area being so high, and also safety concerns make that solution impractical.
- Sundberg:** Perhaps the public water-side area should be moved to another site. An industrial site may not be the place for a public park.
- ACTION:** **The Commission recommends approval of the improvements at the south end of Harbor Island. The Commission asks that other alternatives be explored for access to Todd Shipyards Corporation parking at the north end of the island. The Commission recommends more efforts be made for public amenities and the possibility of off-site mitigation. The Commission would like to discuss street vacation policies and strategies with the Port of Seattle at a future date.**

071797.4 Project: **AQUARIUM "SOUND TO MOUNTAIN" EXHIBIT**
 Phase: Schematics
 Presenters: Tim Motzer, Department of Parks and Recreation
 Chip Reay, HOK Design
 Sally Nikoliyevich, HOK Design
 Elizabeth Morgan, HOK Design
 Time: 45min. (0.3%)

The new "Sound to Mountains" Exhibit replaces the existing exhibit south of the last marine mammal tank. The 4 fundamental themes of this project, as given by Tim Motzer, are:

- The physical aspects/functionality of the Watershed;
- Natural and man-made change and impacts to the Watershed;
- Cultural aspects of the Watershed
- Becoming a steward(caretaker) of the Watershed.

The design team presented 3 alternative designs, all focusing on the salmon as the marker of watershed life. The organizing feature of the exhibit is the journey of the salmon and the impacts of agriculture, dams, and lumbering on the progression of salmon from the sound to the mountains. The experience is enhanced by pools of ambient sounds of the natural setting, supplemented by voices of people, such as biologists, lumbermen, and others who have an effect on the salmon environment. These sound pools will be divided into 3 segments, the upper river, the middle river, and the lower river. The design team is attempting to include sensory elements, such as voices of northwest people, water sounds, industry, and etc., in the exhibit. The majority of the exhibit includes a series of progressive wall-mounted displays leading to the climactic waterfall/forest scene at the end. The design team anticipates using as much sensory technology as the budget will allow to ensure an exciting exhibit.

The journey of the salmon serves as the baseline for the 2 primary schemes. A “scroll” mural painted on the wall depicts the salmon cycle. This painting will also be integrated with visual technology. One possibility for this technology is a series of 4 ft. by 4 ft. video screens, placed consecutively or stacked, showing the continuous journey up the river. This option is costly and would increase the budget by approximately \$200,000.

Scheme A:

- Voices will be represented by large murals of northwest people.
- Fog will mark the transition to the river display
- River display follows straight outer wall of exhibit.
- Exhibit ends at the mountain waterfall.

Scheme B:

- Entry area winds and curves toward river, with voice/sounds but without murals.
- River section follows the curved wall of the existing tank.
- Exhibit ends at the mountain waterfall.

Discussion

Darwish: Are there going to be smells in the exhibit as well?

Reay: The technology is available if we can afford it. We want to appeal to as many senses as possible within what the \$850,000 budget allows.

Darwish: What kinds of participatory actions are available for children in the walk-through section?

Reay: Yes. There will be many opportunities, such as digging around a nurse log, looking through microscopes, pushing buttons to see video clips, computer interactive things, and various things of discovery.

Dubrow: You gave us a great human eye view of the walk-through. Could you give us a fish-eye view of the exhibit?

- Reay:** The most substantive single environment is the upland river and stream. The otter exhibit is in the front and the trout are in the back. The ambition of this water course and the waterfall is innovative. There are 110 feet of river that are divided into zones that can be looked at individually.
- Batra:** My preference is leaning toward the latter option with the main river display on the curved tank wall.
- Sundberg:** It's headed towards a wonderful exhibit. Are there sufficient funds to keep it functioning and maintaining interactive pieces?
- Motzer:** The aquarium has a substantial budget for exhibit maintenance.
- Foley:** What is the life expectancy of this exhibit?
- Motzer:** Generally the life of exhibits is about 10 years. I think that's a realistic time frame.
- Sundberg:** There should be opportunities for interim maintenance and minor improvements.
- Reay:** It's important for us to keep information as up-to-date as possible. The internet is a way for us to access immediate information.
- Dubrow:** The separating out of the children's activities is a little disappointing.
- Reay:** The children's activities are fully integrated with the rest of the exhibit. They are not in a separate area of their own.
- Dubrow:** Thank you for clarifying that.
- Hansmire:** I am intrigued by the stream and the waterfall.
- Sundberg:** It's a rather exciting piece of design work.

- ACTION:** **The Commission recommends approval of schematic design as presented, with the following comments:**
- **ensure a future budget for continued maintenance and information updates.**
 - **pursue the design which locates the primary river displays along the curved wall of the tank, hiding the end from view.**

071797.5

COMMISSION BUSINESS

- A. MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 1997 Approved as amended.
MINUTES OF JUNE 19, 1997 Approved as amended
- B. EMP Site Treatment: The Experience Music Project requested a street-use permit for a non-standard sidewalk treatment. Sundberg and Foley will serve on the subcommittee.
- C. MUNICIPAL CAMPUS UPDATE: Representatives of the Joint Working Group on the Municipal Campus, (comprised of Design and Planning Commissioners and representatives from the Key Tower Citizens Advisory Group and Citizens Capitol Advisory Group) along with Design and Planning Commission staff has briefed Councilmembers Martha Choe, Jan Drago, Tina Podlodowski, and Jane Noland on the group's recommendations. Briefings with the remaining Councilmembers are being scheduled for the next two weeks.

- D. CONVENTION CENTER EXPANSION - REPORT ON DOWNTOWN DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING OF 7/2/97, INTERNAL DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING 7/9/97: In the 2nd design review board meeting the Convention Center returned with a revised scheme; a large open lobby, not retail on the corner, a clear reveal between Eagles Auditorium and the new structure. The degree of integration between the lobby and office is unclear. Results of the Pike St. workshop, held in June, were presented to the internal design review committee.
- E. DESIGN REVIEW EVALUATION BRIEFING TO COUNCIL COMMITTEE: The Parks and Open Grounds Committee of City Council was briefed on the Seattle Design Commission's evaluation of Design Review on 6/25. The Department of Construction and Land use will be preparing a response to be presented to Committee in early August. A public hearing will be scheduled in early September prior to any action being taken by City Council.
- F. POLICE STATION PROJECTS CONSULTANT SELECTION: Commissioner Batra reported.
- G. SAND POINT OPERATIONS: Commissioner Batra reported.

071797.6 Project: **SPACE NEEDLE**
 Phase: Schematic
 Presenters: Dave Buchan, Seattle Center
 Gary Wakatsuki, Callison Architecture
 John Taylor, Callison Architecture
 Russ Goodman, Space Needle Corporation
 Jerry Ernst, TRA
 Attendees: Beverly Barnett, Seattle Transportation
 Joe Taskey, Seattle Transportation
 Time: 45 min. (.3%)

As requested by the Commission, the Space Needle Corporation has pursued landmark status for the Space Needle.

Landmarks Board review meeting report:

Karen Gordon commented on the meeting of the Architectural Committee of the Landmarks Review Board. The board appreciated the transparency of the new structure as respecting the Space Needle's integrity. They were concerned about having to put some sort of solids behind the Space Needle legs. Also a concern was the treatment of the original ground plane or pad on which the Needle sits. The potential clutter caused by a multitude of canopies is also troublesome. The design has been slowed pending comments from the Commission and the Landmarks Board.

Building design development:

The current structure at the base of the Space Needle was originally intended as a temporary structure to provide shelter to waiting visitors to the needle. The structure is no longer useful due to the present and anticipated volume of visitors. The design team studied three alternatives and have chosen to pursue the option that they believe best respects and responds to the architecture of the Space Needle. A two story glass structure is proposed to sit at the base of the needle, nestled up against the three legs. The solid wall areas behind the legs of the Needle solve problems of fire-proofing of the cross-bracing, vertical diaphragms, and vertical chases for ducts. The interior retail will consist of more animated activities which require simplicity in the glass box. These activities will be clustered primarily around the solid center of the structure allowing circulation towards the perimeter. Glass fins will add stability to the glass wall planes. The roof will be transparent at the edges and sheet metal toward the center.

Broad street improvements were not addressed in the presentation.

For more information, see the Design Commission minutes from 6/5/97.

Discussion

- Sundberg:** What type of glass are you thinking about using?
- Taylor:** It will be an almost clear glass with a slight green tint.
- Hansmire:** What are the solid areas going to be clad with?
- Taylor:** Metal panel.
- Wakatsuki:** Another component to this project is the retail space. By keeping the box as simple as possible we can further express its contrast with the ticketing kiosks, signage, and etc.
- Dubrow:** How will the interior design impact the transparency of the whole?
- Wakatsuki:** It will have a very retail quality. The story is about the northwest and the kinds of businesses here that identify the northwest. The Space Needle will be a place that you come to find out what is happening in the region. The retail area is heading in the right direction. The canopies need to be refined within the story-line or the theme of the retail piece. The inside is really as important as the outside, due to the transparency of the box. The next level would be developing the story-line of the Space Needle with the canopies, the retail spaces, and the glass enclosure.
- Hansmire:** Conceptually those retail pieces are supporting that transparent box.
- Sundberg:** Have you thought about the interior and exterior lighting?
- Taylor:** The retailing concept is heavily based on the lighting.
- Wakatsuki:** We are looking at the lighting from the point of view of not only what needs to be illuminated inside, but also of relighting the exterior of the Space Needle.
- Hansmire:** Are the opaque panels behind the columns?
- Wakatsuki:** My understanding is that we are exploring the options of keeping the diagonal bracing there and working the glazing around them.
- Taylor:** It makes a lot of sense to have that solid space for mechanical and fire-proofing purposes.
- Foley:** The concept for this building is a great improvement over the existing structure at the base of the Needle.

- Hansmire:** The bullseye feel of the turnaround area seems to be in opposition to the rest of the site development. It is clearly an indication of an automotive zone. It lacks the desired integration of pedestrian zones and auto zones.
- Foley:** The rationale for the building at the base of the Space Needle was clear. But I wasn't clear on the rationale for the location of the turnaround.
- Dubrow:** At the last meeting, the Commission asked for significant development of that area. What is the nature of the pedestrian and vehicle relationship? What are the connections between the green space with the adjacent buildings? I'm troubled that you bring it back without that work being done.
- Taylor:** Our focus was on the building itself and we didn't want to confuse the two issues. We would be more than happy to come back at the next meeting and talk more about the open space.

ACTION: The Commission recommends approval of the glass structure at the base of the Space Needle pending:

- final landmark status,
- seeing samples of the proposed glass,
- further discussion of the solid areas, discussion of lighting type (interior exterior.), retail concepts, connection of glass addition at the juncture of legs, base.

071797.7 Project: **PACIFIC PLACE**
 Phase: Update/Discussion
 Presenters: Matt Griffin, Pine Street Development
 Jane Lewis, Pine Street Development
 Time: 45 min. (hourly)

Pacific Place is part of the three block development, including the current Nordstrom store, and the F & N building, bounded by Pine St. and Olive Way, and 6th and 7th Avenues. It is a 90,000 square ft. full block with 6 levels of underground parking, with a 1200 car capacity, which will be transferred to city ownership and management upon completion. There will be 335,000 gross ft. of leasable space with the main entrance on Pine. A crescent shaped interior atrium is intended to extend the sidewalk inside using concrete floors and street lamps.

Developer Matt Griffin is thinking about asking for some technical changes in the code about signage. Two issues were brought before the Design Commission for discussion. The first issue is the code limits tenant signs to a maximum of 65 ft. At the time the code was written it was unthinkable that retail spaces would extend above this height. Pacific Place will have retail spaces up on the 4th floor of a building with no place for signage at the ground floor level. The second issue is the allowance of information kiosks on the curb side of the sidewalk.

Discussion

- Griffin:** Is there a way we can change the code to allow signage above 65 ft., not just for our project, but also for others? We don't know of a lot of other places with retail on the 4th floor. At the time it was set at 65 ft. no one expected the downtown to have this kind of vertical retail. Today we have it. Recently hotels have been allowed to put signage on their exteriors for convenience for out-of-town guests.
- Darwish:** Will people be able to see the signs?
- Griffin:** Yes, they will be painted and top-lit from the cornice above. The signs will be equally visible and have a relatively uniform size and scale.
- Dubrow:** I worry about the return of the big box with lots of signage. It would be more discrete to use logos and emblems at the upper levels which refer to a system at the entranceway. How do you see crafting the language of the code revision?
- Griffin:** One way is to just change the limit from 65 ft. to 85 ft. Another option is to phrase it such that extending signage to between 65 and 86 ft. was contingent on that occupant not having space at ground level on which to place a sign. There could also be some kind of design review process.
- Hansmire:** If you said that occupants with less than 10,000 square ft. could exceed the 65 ft. limit you would eliminate the corporate signage issue.
- Sundberg:** I like the signage. The problem is trying to figure out the language that could ensure the quality represented in your rendering.
- Foley:** I'm concerned that billboard type advertisement might result from changing the code.
- Dubrow:** Perhaps a variance could be allowed so that an increase in elevation to 85 ft. is a possibility for those who attempt to enhance the urban context of downtown with their building. A bonus to reward good design.
- Griffin:** My other question is about whether we should attempt to put kiosks on Pine which would refer to the buildings tenants and uses. They would be near the curb in the region of sidewalk used primarily for utilitarian functions, such as lamps, garbage cans, hydrants, trees, etc. Is there something we can put out there that won't hinder pedestrian usage of the sidewalk?
- Dubrow:** I would encourage the use of the entry space to develop information kiosks.
- Griffin:** In addition to the kiosks, we were thinking of placing benches in that area of the sidewalk for pedestrians use.
- ACTION:** No action required, discussion only.

071797.7 Project: **HOLLY PARK COMMUNITY FACILITIES**
 Phase: Schematics
 Presenters: Stan Lokting, ARC Architects
 Melanie Davies, Swift & Company
 Ellen Sollod, artist
 Attendees: Stephen Antupit, Office of Management and Planning
 Ed Weinstein, Weinstein Copeland Architects
 Henry Popkin, Popkin Development
 Time: 1 hr. 15 min.

Building Plan:

The Community Facilities for Holly Park consist of the Campus of Learners, Family Center, and Management Offices. The Campus of Learners building fronts Othello and Myrtle streets. It will consist of a branch of South Seattle Community College and the Seattle Public Library branch on the ground floor with a connection to the Youth Tutoring program, and Private Industry Council on the upper level. The Family Center will have a variety of social and multi-use functions on the upper level and 3 daycare providers including Head Start at the lower level. The Management Offices are approximately 2,000 square ft. While maintaining a strong presence on the street the 3 buildings create a central outdoor plaza and terrace. The Family Center and the Campus of Learners are entered from the plaza on the same level. There has been an emphasis on creating meaningful gathering spaces. The design responds to the greater context and provides opportunities for community and artist input.

Artwork Plan:

Holly Park residents are interested in art. The residents associated with the idea of a “globe in a village”, and thus the artwork will try to respond to the unique community of 17 various cultures. The artwork will be based on the notions of memory as past, reason as present, and imagination as future. There will be a wayfinding element for non-English speaking residents. The integration of artwork and architecture to create places both for contemplation and for celebration is emphasized. They would like to proceed with artist selection as soon as possible.

For more information, see the Design Commission minutes from 4/3/97, 2/6/97, 1/18/97.

Discussion

Dubrow: You have done a great job identifying artists opportunities. I see the benefits of having a clear art plan that identifies the concrete opportunities, but I also see the benefits of bringing a few other artists in. They might be able to identify some additional sites that you might not have perceived, recognized, or considered as artists opportunities. The plan has a great deal of structure, but a great deal of room for openness to the artists own perceptions would be a beneficial addition.

Sollod: I think that phase 2 and 3 are where that might happen. I don't know how you could do that right now for the Campus of Learners and the Family Center.

- Dubrow:** I encourage you to stagger the involvement of artists in a longer term approach.
- Sollod:** We've tried to identify the areas that need early involvement as opposed to later involvement. We have a 3-way process for selecting artists proposed.
- Hansmire:** There are a whole lot of ideas here. What I keep searching for is a focus. How does it make one focused statement about something in the project?
- Lokting:** I would say that the one primary focus is open space and its connection to the terrace between the buildings. Additionally there will be visual connections from these spaces into the lobby spaces, which are very transparent on the exterior.
- Hansmire:** I think I would like to hear from all the elements and how each one of them support the concept of making that plaza work. Otherwise it will be a series of potential nice experiences that don't have a focus. In both the architecture, the site, and the artwork I'm looking for more simplicity.
- Sundberg:** I also think simplicity would help. A more expressive glazing in the community room would also help. The south facade could be better organized allowing more of a presence.
- Dubrow:** I also have trouble recognizing the building type from the south facade.
- Sundberg:** A unifying quality would be nice. The community college is a much tighter and more civic piece of organization.
- Foley:** Is there a way of identifying the building function from the roads?
- Lokting:** The library will be identifiable by seeing the stacks and the reading areas. The community college, being on the second floor, has a much greater challenge.
- Sollod:** The large playground equipment outside the daycare will give a clear identity as a child play area.
- Dubrow:** I wish for a little more playfulness or a more joyful expression of the entry. What's constraining the building in that way?
- Lokting:** It may be in the detailing. We will look at the detailing in the entry.
- Sundberg:** There are some opportunities for threading some lines and paving through the plaza and into the entryways and lobbies.
- Sollod:** Elements would be brought in from the outside.
- Hansmire:** If those flow together as a unit then you begin to appreciate the architecture. It's unclear at this point without being able to see these details on the plans.
- Foley:** With such a difficult site, some the complexities arise from having to fit a large program on it. Is the management office at the same finished floor elevation as the campus of learners?
- Davies:** The finished floor of the management building is about 2 ft. higher than the other 2 buildings. Then the trees are 2 ft. below the campus of learners. So what's created is a depression, and by putting a bridge across it we are making it a special place.
- Hansmire:** If the plaza is the overall special place, then the bridge needs to reinforce the plaza as the special place not be a special place itself.
- Davies:** It marks the transition point from the parking lot into the plaza.
- Hansmire:** I keep looking for ways all these elements build to that plaza and those entryways, which to me is the essence of the site and the layout.
- Lokting:** Are you saying that you wouldn't make the bridge special?

Hansmire: There are a whole lot of sides on the street and all of them try to out-spin the other. The bridge could be special, but quietly special. It could be special in the way it handles itself relative to the plaza.

Dubrow: I suggest that you strongly articulate what the focal point is in the plaza. What is the main element for everyone, from artists to citizens, to focus on. Artists should know what role they are playing in supporting the progress development and focal point. Having this will help you choose artists. It should be laid out on paper what the intentions are in terms of the creation of this space as well as what they are contributing to it.

Sollod: We have tried to establish a comprehensive plan for art opportunities. We have also developed a priority list based on what funding is available.

Dubrow: I am suggesting good guidelines for the artist to follow.

Foley: I question the need for an extra entrance to the parking lot on 32nd.

ACTION: **The Commission recommends approval of the schematic development. The Commission requests to see the main concept reinforced through further development of :**

- **integration of arts program with the architecture;**
- **south elevation of Family Center building;**
- **landscape elements.**

Furthermore, the Commission recommends that the focal point be better identified and strengthened.